

**CITY OF CHULA VISTA**

**GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION**

**2004 Community Workshop Edition for the**

**2003 GMOC ANNUAL REPORT**

**Review Period 7/1/02 to 6/30/03**  
***And Five Year Forecast to December 2008***

**Commission Members**

William Tripp, Chair (Environmental)  
David W. Krogh, Vice Chair (Sweetwater/Bonita)  
Arthur M. Garcia, (Education)  
Rafael Munoz (Eastern Territories)  
Michael Spethman (Center City)  
Steve Palma (Southwest)  
Richard Arroyo (Business)  
Gary L. Nordstrom (Development)  
Kevin O'Neill (Planning Commission)

**Staff**

Daniel Forster, Growth Management Coordinator  
Cherryl Cisneros, Management Assistant  
Allen Edwards, Planning Intern

**April 8, 2004**

**CITY OF CHULA VISTA  
GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION  
2004 COMMUNITY WORKSHOP EDITION**

---

**Table of Contents**

<b><u>1.0</u></b>	<b><u>INTRODUCTION.....</u></b>	<b><u>3</u></b>
1.1	Letter from the Chair .....	3
1.2	The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC).....	4
1.3	Review Process .....	4
1.4	Growth Forecast .....	4
<b><u>2.0</u></b>	<b><u>THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY.....</u></b>	<b><u>6</u></b>
<b><u>3.0</u></b>	<b><u>THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE.....</u></b>	<b><u>8</u></b>
3.1	FISCAL.....	8
3.1.1	DIF Fees .....	8
3.2	AIR QUALITY .....	9
3.3	SEWER.....	10
3.3.1	Timely Construction of the City's Trunk Sewer System .....	10
3.3.2	Purchasing Rights Capacity With The San Diego Metropolitan Water Authority (METRO) .....	11
3.4	WATER .....	12
3.4.1	Water Distribution System Capacity .....	12
3.5	LIBRARIES .....	14
3.5.1	Library Building Plan .....	14
3.6	DRAINAGE.....	16
3.6.1	Drainage East and West.....	16
3.6.2	GMOC Drainage Workshop.....	17
3.7	PARKS & RECREATION .....	18
3.7.1	Western Chula Vista Park Standard .....	18
3.7.2	Joint Use of City/School Recreation Facilities.....	19
3.8	POLICE.....	20
3.8.1	Threshold Met .....	21
3.8.2	Removal of False Alarms from Urgent Response Times .....	22
3.9	FIRE / EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES .....	23
3.9.1	Maintaining Threshold .....	23
3.10	TRAFFIC.....	25
3.10.1	Traffic Workshop.....	25
3.10.2	Traffic Threshold Met.....	25
3.10.3	Timely Construction of SR-125 .....	26
3.10.4	Moderating Growth Due to Traffic Impacts .....	26
3.10.5	Traffic Issues: Highway Congestion and Transit Threshold.....	27

3.10.6	Road Classification Error .....	28
3.10.7	Concurrent Construction and Public Notification .....	29
<b>3.11</b>	<b>SCHOOLS.....</b>	<b>30</b>
3.11.1	Threshold Compliance .....	31
3.11.2	Growth and School Financing.....	32
3.11.3	School Construction.....	34
3.11.4	Joint Use.....	35

---

Workshop Draft

# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

## 1.1 Letter from the Chair

To: Chula Vista Community Members

The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) will be holding our annual Community Workshop to present our draft growth management recommendations. The final recommendations will be presented to the Planning Commission and City Council later this Spring. It is at the Community Workshop where we, the GMOC Commissioners and not City staff, will explain to the community the basis for our draft recommendations and hear from you if you agree or not, and to tell us what other issues and recommendations should be raised.

Our principle mandate as a Commission is to monitor and comment on whether public facilities, services and improvements meeting city standards (including Quality of Life Threshold Standards) exist or will become available concurrent with the need created by new development in both eastern and western sections of the city.

In the following document we provide background on the Commission, the review process we follow each year, a summary of the 5 year growth forecast, and then a discussion on each of our eleven quality of life thresholds with a statement of the threshold, if it has been met or not and if it is expected to be met in the future. Where the Commission has deemed it appropriate specific recommendations are made.

We hope you participate in the workshop.

Sincerely,

Bill Tripp, GMOC Chair

## 1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

In November 1987, the City Council adopted the original Threshold Standards Policy for Chula Vista establishing “quality-of-life” indicators for eleven public facility and service topics. The Policy addresses each topic in terms of a goal, objective(s), a “threshold” or standard, and implementation measures. Adherence to these citywide standards is intended to preserve and enhance both the environment and residents’ quality of life as growth occurs. To provide an independent, annual, City-wide Threshold Standards compliance review, the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) was created. It is composed of nine members representing each of the City’s four major geographic areas, a member of the Planning Commission, and a cross section of interests including education, environment, business, and development.

The GMOC’s review is structured around three time frames:

1. A fiscal year cycle to accommodate City Council review of GMOC recommendations, which may have budget implications, therefore the report focuses on the previous fiscal year for detailed data collection, which in this case is July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003.
2. Pertinent issues identified during the second half of 2003 and early 2004 are also addressed. This is to assure that the GMOC can and does respond to current events.
3. A five-year forecast covering the period from January 2004 through December 2008 is assessed for potential threshold compliance concerns. This assures that the GMOC has a future orientation.

During this process, the GMOC encourages each City Department and outside agency, which has responsibility for reporting on the threshold status, to review the appropriateness of the threshold and whether new thresholds and or standards should be considered.

## 1.3 Review Process

The GMOC has held 12 regular meetings from September 2003 through March 2004. In addition, GMOC members participated in a City field trip, hosted a Community Workshop on how the traffic threshold is defined and monitored. City Departments and outside agencies completed threshold questionnaires. GMOC members reviewed the questionnaires and, where necessary, asked department or agency representatives to appear in person to make clarifications and to answer questions.

## 1.4 Growth Forecast

In October 2003 the GMOC “Preliminary” Five Year Growth Forecast was issued<sup>1</sup>. This forecast was issued to provide departments and outside agencies with an estimate of the magnitude of residential growth to be anticipated over the over the next five years. Each department and outside agency was then asked how their respective public facility/service would be able to accommodate that growth. The forecast from January 2004 through December 2008, indicated an additional 11,400 residential units would be permitted for construction in the city, for an annual average of 2,280 units.

---

<sup>1</sup> The forecast was updated after January 1, 2004 to reflect actual building permits issued and housing units finalized. The forecast is available on the City’s web site.

One of the assumptions of that forecast was that “Building caps are not imposed on development”. In essence, the Permit Monitoring Program adopted by the City Council on April 15, 2003 has imposed such a system to be applied from April 2003 through March 2006. The Permit Monitoring system will lower the number of permits relative to the forecast over that period. However, as the GMOC forecast is for a five-year period, units that were forestalled by the Permit Monitoring Program may after March 2006 come forward. In addition, to be conservative, it is prudent to maintain the estimate of 1x,xxx residential units over the next 5 years so that facility and service levels are measured against a higher standard. Annual updates will be provided.

Workshop Draft

## 2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

PRELIMINARY 2003 THRESHOLD STANDARD – ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY REVIEW PERIOD 7/1/02 THROUGH 6/30/03		
Topic	Threshold Not Met	Threshold Met
Fiscal		X
Air Quality		X
Sewer		X
Water		X
Libraries		X
Drainage		X
Parks & Recreation		
<i>Land</i>		X
<i>Facilities</i>		X
Police		
Priority I (81%/Average)		X/X
Priority II (57%/Average)	X/X	
Fire/EMS	X	
Traffic		X
Schools		
<i>Chula Vista Elementary</i>		X
<i>Sweetwater Union High School District</i>	X	

**PRELIMINARY 2003 THRESHOLD STANDARD – ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY  
AND FIVE YEAR ASSESSMENT  
January 2004 through December 2008**

Threshold	Threshold Will Be Met	Threshold Likely Met	Potential for Future Non-Compliance	Pending Threshold Standard Amendments	Statement of Concern	Adopt/Fund Tactics to Achieve Compliance
Fiscal	X					
Air Quality	X					
Sewer	X					
Water	X					
Libraries			X			X
Drainage	X					
Parks and Recreation						
Land	X					
Facilities	X					
Police		X				
Priority I (81%/Average)		X/X				
Priority II (57%/Average)			X/X			
Fire/EMS			X			
Traffic		X				
Schools						
Chula Vista Elementary		X			X	
Sweetwater Union High School District			X		X	



## 3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE

### 3.1 FISCAL

**Threshold:** The GMOC shall be provided with an annual Development Impact Fee (DIF) Report, which provides an analysis of development impact fees collected and expended over the previous 12-month period.

#### **THRESHOLD FINDING:**

**Current**

*In Compliance*

**Future:**

*Threshold Likely Met*

---

#### 3.1.1 DIF Fees

**Issue:** Collections and expenditures of DIF revenues have been sufficient to ensure that necessary infrastructure and services are available to support the demands of new growth. In addition, the GMOC was provided with a presentation detailing the basis for the recent Public Facilities Development Impact Fee (PFDIF) increase.

**Recommendation:** No recommendations at this time.

## 3.2 AIR QUALITY

### Threshold:

#### The GMOC Shall Be Provided With An Annual Report Which:

1. Provides an overview and evaluation of local development projects approved during the prior year to determine to what extent they implemented measures designed to foster air quality improvement pursuant to relevant regional and local air quality improvement strategies.
2. Identifies whether the City's development regulations, policies, and procedures relate to, and/or are consistent with current applicable federal, state, and regional air quality regulations and programs.
3. Identifies non-development related activities being undertaken by the City toward compliance with relevant federal, state, and local regulations regarding air quality, and whether the City has achieved compliance.

The City shall provide a copy of said report to the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for review and comment. In addition, the APCD shall report on overall regional and local air quality conditions, the status of regional air quality improvement implementation efforts under the Regional Air Quality Strategy and related federal and state programs, and the affect of those efforts/programs on the City of Chula Vista and local planning and development activities.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

#### CURRENT:

*In Compliance*

#### FUTURE

*Threshold Likely Met*

---

### 3.2.1 Discussion:

#### City Policy on Alternative Fuel Vehicles

#### Issue:

It has come to the attention of the GMOC that the City does not have a policy regarding the acquisition and use of alternative fuel vehicles.

#### Recommendation:

That the City Council direct the City Manager to assign appropriate City staff to develop and recommend a policy position regarding the acquisition and use of alternative fueled vehicles and that this policy recommendation be reported to the GMOC during next years review cycle.

### 3.3 SEWER

**Threshold:**

1. Sewage flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering Standards.
2. The City shall annually provide the San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater Authority with a 12-18 month development forecast and request confirmation that the projection is within the City's purchased capacity rights and an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth, or the City Public Works Department staff shall gather the necessary data. The information provided to the GMOC shall include:
  - a. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
  - b. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecasted growth.
  - c. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
  - d. Other relevant information.

The Authority response letters shall be provided to the GMOC for inclusion in its review.

**THRESHOLD FINDING:**

**CURRENT**

*In Compliance*

**FUTURE**

*Threshold Likely Met*

---

#### 3.3.1 Timely Construction of the City's Trunk Sewer System

**Issue:**

Two major trunk sewer systems are necessary to support the City's growth through build out, these are the Salt Creek and Wolf Canyon sewer lines.

Construction of the Salt Creek Trunk Sewer segments is necessary to serve growth over the next five to seven years. Until the Salt Creek Trunk Sewer is installed, new development in the Poggi Canyon basin must temporarily pump sewage to the Telegraph Canyon Trunk sewer.

Construction on the Salt Creek Sewer began in 2002 and is expected to be completed within 2004. The estimated cost for the Salt Creek Trunk Sewer is \$18 million.

The Wolf Canyon Sewer is currently in the preliminary planning stages. It is estimated to cost \$7 million and be completed by June 2006.

**Acknowledgment:**

Trunk sewer segments to support the City's sewer collection and transmission system through buildout is either in place or planned to coincide with growth. The GMOC will seek annual updates on progress.

### 3.3.2 Purchasing Rights Capacity With The San Diego Metropolitan Water Authority (METRO)

**Issue:**

The City now has 20.875mgd of capacity rights with METRO. However, recent analysis indicates that this may not be sufficient to support the City's overall sewer capacity needs at buildout. As part of the Wastewater Master Plan Update, the City's buildout requirement is being evaluated. Based on flow analysis by City staff, it is estimated that by the year 2020, the city will be generating approximately 21.468 MGD of sewage. Further analysis will be conducted based on the updated General Plan.

SEWAGE Flow and Treatment Capacity				
	02/03 Fiscal Year <sup>1</sup>	Projection for next 18 months <sup>2</sup>	Projection for next 5 years <sup>3</sup>	Projection for "Buildout"
Average Flow (MGD)	15.951	17.500	19.508	21.468
Capacity	20.875**	20.875	20.875	20.875

\*\* Increase in capacity is based on the allocation of additional capacity rights resulting from the construction of the new Southbay Treatment Plant

1 In fiscal year 01/02 the city added approximately 2,500 new homes and 7,600 increase in population citywide.

2 Anticipate that there will be up to an additional 3,750 dwelling units and 11,385 residents between 7/1/02 through 12/31/03.

3 Over the next 5 years (year ending 2007) there may be up to 12,500 new homes and 38,000 additional residents.

**Recommendation:**

That next years report to the GMOC provide an update on the capacity shortfall and the strategy to increase the City's capacity rights or other options that may be available.

## 3.4 WATER

### Threshold:

1. Developer will request and deliver to the City a service availability letter from the Water District for each project.
2. The City shall annually provide the San Diego County Water Authority, the Sweetwater Authority, and the Otay Municipal Water District with a 12-18 month development forecast and request evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth. The Districts' replies should address the following:
  - a. Water availability to the City and Planning Area, considering both short and long term perspectives.
  - b. Amount of current capacity, including storage capacity, now used or committed.
  - c. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecast growth.
  - d. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
  - e. Other relevant information the Districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

**CURRENT**  
*In Compliance*

**FUTURE**  
*Threshold Likely Met*

---

### 3.4.1 Water Distribution System Capacity

#### Issue:

In western Chula Vista the ability of the existing water distribution system to support potential land use in-fill and intensification is reported to be well positioned. The Sweetwater District has engaged an aggressive upgrading program whereby the water system is getting younger every year. The district's capital improvement program is poised to upgrade their system to meet current standards and support growth. There will remain site specific situations that will have to be addressed, but the system as a whole is sound.

**Recommendation:**

That the City continues to work in cooperation with the Sweetwater Authority in identifying strategic water distribution improvements and funding mechanisms.

Workshop Draft

## 3.5 LIBRARIES

**Threshold:** The City shall construct 60,000 gross square feet (GSF) of additional library space, over the June 30, 2000 GSF total, in the area east of Interstate 805 by buildout. The construction of said facilities shall be phased such that the City will not fall below the citywide ratio of 500 GSF per 1,000 population. Library facilities are to be adequately equipped and staffed.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

#### CURRENT

***In Compliance (6/30/2003)***

Actual: 502 gross square feet per 1,000 population.

***Not in Compliance (12/31/2003)***

Estimated: 491 gross square feet per 1,000 population.

#### FUTURE

***Not in Compliance***

---

### 3.5.1 Library Building Plan

**Issue:** The Library Master Plan calls for the construction of a 30,000 square foot full-service, regional library in Rancho Del Rey by 2005. This library would be constructed on City-owned property located at East H Street and Paseo Ranchero. This library is expected to be open by 2006.

Given the population growth of the community a temporary library threshold failure will occur. In fact, based on current population estimates for year end 2003 of 207,888, the total library square feet required equals 103,944 ( $207,888/1000 \times 500$ ). This represents a current shortfall of approximately 1,944 square feet ( $103,944 - 102,000$ ).

According to the Growth Management Program "Should the GMOC determine that the Threshold Standard is not being satisfied, then the City Council shall formally adopt and fund tactics to bring the library system into compliance. Construction or other actual solutions shall be scheduled to commence within three years."

One way to address this shortfall is to begin construction of additional library space by year end 2006. As stated above, construction of the Rancho del Rey library is expected to be completed by this time.

**Acknowledgement:**

The City has taken a proactive position and is continuing to actively pursue the Rancho Del Rey Library Planning/Building Plan Program and has placed as a priority the identification of adequate construction funding with a target completion date of 2006.

Workshop Draft



## 3.6 DRAINAGE

**Threshold:** Stormwater flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering standards.

The GMOC shall annually review the performance of the City's storm drain system to determine its ability to meet the goals and objectives listed above.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

**CURRENT**  
*In Compliance*

**FUTURE**  
*Threshold Likely Met*

---

### 3.6.1 Drainage East and West

**Issue:** The adequacy of drainage facilities in Chula Vista's eastern "new" growth areas is an integral aspect of planning and development with financing documented in a Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP). The drainage infrastructure is then made a requirement as development proceeds so as to attain concurrency. This process has been an apparent success as the GMOC has not found drainage to be an issue in eastern Chula Vista.

Drainage in the west is another matter. While not a product of growth drainage facilities in the west are in various degrees of service. Some facilities provide adequate service while others have decayed with age and are not performing adequately. Further, as standards for drainage has increased over the years the older western facilities have not been updated nor are they required to be. Given these combined factors, portions of the current drainage system in western Chula Vista represent a level of service that is below what the GMOC would consider adequate in eastern Chula Vista. It is a positive step that these conditions are being comprehensively identified in the current Drainage Master Plan.

Although, the GMOC has no direct role in non-growth related impacts, there is still a quality of life concern that the GMOC believes the City should address. At the same time, the GMOC recognizes that the city has budgeted \$5.3 million for the current fiscal year to upgrade drainage in western Chula Vista. This amount of funding is significant because it represents as much as a ten fold increase from previous years. The need

for additional funding to carry out further improvements relative to the soon to be completed Drainage Master Plan will be reviewed by the GMOC.

Development in-fill and land use intensification are likely to occur in western Chula Vista. This growth will fall under the purview of the growth management program and therefore the GMOC. It is the understanding of the GMOC that a comparable public facilities financing program will be implemented to assure that this new growth will pay their fair share for drainage improvements in western Chula Vista.

**Recommendation:**

That the City Council direct the City Manager to have appropriate City staff to provide the GMOC a briefing during next years review cycle on how new development in western Chula Vista will be required to pay their fair share of public improvements in general and drainage in particular.

### **3.6.2 GMOC Drainage Workshop**

**Acknowledgment:**

As one of last year's recommendations the GMOC requested a workshop on how funding priorities are set for the replacement of corrugated metal pipes (CMP). This workshop was presented to the GMOC at their meeting of December 11, 2003.

Workshop Draft

### 3.7 PARKS & RECREATION

**Threshold:** Three acres of neighborhood and community parkland with appropriate facilities shall be provided per 1,000 residents east of I-805.

#### THRESHOLD FINDING:

##### CURRENT:

*In Compliance*

**Land:** Actual: 3.14 acres per 1,000 residents east of I-805

**Facilities:** Actual Facilities – Based on Parks Master Plan

##### FUTURE:

**LAND:** *Will Be Met*

**FACILITY:** *Threshold Likely Met*

---

#### 3.7.1 Western Chula Vista Park Standard

##### Issue:

Currently, there is no park standard in place for western Chula Vista. The GMOC has made two observations/recommendations related to this situation over the last several years:

1. there should be a park standard developed for western Chula Vista, and;
2. that the standard adopted will of necessity need to be different from that of the east given the vastly different situations between each areas.

It is understood that at the current time there are efforts to create a western Chula Vista standard through the development of a western Chula Vista Parks Master Plan and an accompanying financing plan with appropriate developer impact fees. The GMOC agrees with this tailored approach and one that indicates funding sources.

The GMOC does not wish to dictate the specifics of such planning efforts, but instead seeks to focus on their results. However, we know that the Parks Master Plan, that was adopted last year, took nearly 8 years to complete. We do not want a repeat of that situation.

##### Recommendation:

That the City Council directs the City Manager to set a reasonable time frame to complete the Western Chula Vista Parks Master Plan, financing program, and related standards and to allocate sufficient resources to

insure that the schedule is met. The GMOC believes that significant progress can be achieved within the next year.

### **3.7.2 Joint Use of City/School Recreation Facilities**

**Issue:**

In last year's report the GMOC made the recommendation that "The City Council should consider the additional joint use of park and recreational resources with the school districts only after a careful analysis of the equitable use of these areas for the benefit of the general public."

The reason for making such a recommendation is that while joint use of facilities is a laudable concept and may work in some communities, the record of success in Chula Vista is not encouraging. The typical scenario is that an agreement or contract is entered into and with all the best intentions the joint use goes forward. Over time, however, there is the erosion of general public use to greater school use. There is no denying that the schools need the recreation facilities for the programs they are responsible to implement. The general public has increasing needs as well.

**Recommendation:**

The rewards of successful joint use makes the attempt worthwhile. However, any joint use recreational facilities should, as current policy dictates, not be counted toward meeting a park and recreation standard as the long term viability of such efforts cannot be assured.

Workshop Draft

### 3.8 POLICE

**Threshold:**

*Emergency Response*<sup>1</sup>: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 81% of the Priority I emergency calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority I calls of five minutes and thirty seconds (5.5 minutes) or less (measured annually).

*Urgent Response*<sup>2</sup>: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 57% of the Priority II, urgent calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority II calls of seven minutes and thirty seconds (7.30 minutes) or less (measured annually).

**THRESHOLD FINDING:**

**CURRENT:**

*Emergency response within 7 min.: Threshold Met*

*Emergency response average time: Threshold Met*

*Urgent Response within 7 minutes: Threshold Not Met*

*Urgent response average time: Threshold Not Met*

**FUTURE:**

*Emergency response within 7 min.: Threshold Likely Met*

*Emergency response average time: Thresholds Likely Met*

*Urgent Response within 7 min.: Threshold Likely Not Met*

*Urgent response average time: Threshold Likely Not Met*

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time	Average Time
Emergency Response	81.0%	7 minutes	5:30 min./sec.
Urgent Response	57.0%	7 minutes	7:30 min./sec
<b>Actual</b>			
Emergency Response	80.8%	7 minutes	4:55min./sec.
Urgent Response	50.2%	7 minutes	9:24min./sec.

1 Priority 1 - Emergency Calls. Life-threatening calls; felony in progress; probability of injury (crime or accident); robbery or panic alarms; urgent cover calls from officers. Response: Immediate response by two officers from any source or assignment, immediate response by paramedics/fire if injuries are believed to have occurred.

2 Priority 2 - Urgent Calls. Misdemeanor in progress; possibility of injury; serious non-routine calls (domestic violence or other disturbances with potential for violence); burglary alarms. Response: Immediate response by two officers from clear units or those on interruptible activities (traffic, field interviews, etc.)

### 3.8.1 Threshold Met

Police response time is just one measure of how police services are keeping pace with growth. Measures to improve response time have been and continue to be implemented; these include such items as maintaining full staffing and technological improvements.

As the table below indicates, the Police Department has made progress in reducing their response time over the past several years. The Police Department is engaged in several initiatives as listed in last years report to continue the reduction in response times.

The GMOC has determined that the Emergency Response Call for Service response time threshold has been met.

<b>HISTORIC RESPONSE TIMES PRIORITY I – Emergency Response, Calls For Service</b>			
	Call Volume	% of Call Response w/in 7 Minutes	Average Response Time
Threshold		81.0%	5:30
FY 2002-03	1,424 of 71,268	80.8%	4:55
FY 2001-02	1,539 of 71,859	80.0%	5:07
FY 2000-01	1,734 of 73,977	79.7%	5:13
FY 1999-00	1,750 of 76,738	75.9%	5:21
CY 1999 <sup>1</sup>	1,890 of 74,405	70.9%	5:50

While achieving the response time threshold, the GMOC is confident that the Police Department will remain diligent in meeting and achieving shorter response times than what is indicated as the Threshold Standard. In achieving shorter response times, the Police Department has made a set of recommendations for which GMOC support is requested. The recommendations are reasonable and the GMOC lends their support aware that budgetary constraints and priority setting will result in a case by case evaluation.

#### **Recommendation:**

The GMOC supports the following Police Department initiatives subject to necessary overriding budgetary considerations :

1. the dispatch staffing model and the Dispatch Manager Concept.
2. continued use of the patrol staffing model and the advance hiring program.
3. planned upgrades of police technologies, such as MDCs, wireless data transmission to patrol vehicles, and global positioning systems

<sup>1</sup> The FY98-99 GMOC report used calendar 1999 data due to the implementation of the new CAD system in mid-1998.

4. research and evaluation of:
  - a. internet crime reporting;
  - b. alternative deployment tactics, such as revised beat configurations and bike patrol; and
  - c. an aerial platform.

### 3.8.2 Removal of False Alarms from Urgent Response Times

**Issue:** The incidence of false alarms seems endemic, and one that will not easily be remedied. As such the GMOC requested that response times to Urgent Calls for Service be calculated without those for false alarms. The result was that response times improved. The GMOC believes that this is a more accurate measure of the Police Department's response to actual urgent calls for service.

**Recommendation:** That future Urgent Calls for Service response times be reported to the GMOC without calls responding to false alarms.

PRIORITY II CFS - Urgent Response, Calls for Service			
	Call Volume	% of Call Response w/in 7 Minutes	Average Response Time
<b>Threshold</b>		<b>57.0%</b>	<b>7:30</b>
FY 2002-03 w/o false Alarms	15,024 of 71,268	50.2%	9:24
FY 2002-03 with false alarms	22,930 of 71,268	46.8%	10:00
FY 2001-02	22,199 of 71,859	45.6%	10:04
FY 2000-01	25,234 of 73,977	47.9%	9:38
FY 1999-00	23,898 of 76,738	46.4%	9:37
CY 1999	20,405 of 74,405	45.8%	9:35
FY 1997-98	22,342 of 69,196	52.9%	8:13
FY 1996-97	22,140 of 69,904	62.2%	6:50
FY 1995-96	21,743 of 71,197	64.5%	6:38
FY 1994-95	21,900 of 73,485	63.4%	6:49

### 3.9 FIRE / EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

**Threshold:** Emergency response: Properly equipped and staffed fire and medical units shall respond to calls throughout the city within seven (7) minutes in 80% (current service to be verified) of the cases (measured annually).

#### THRESHOLD FINDING:

**CURRENT:** *Not in Compliance*

**FUTURE:** *Potential for Future Non-Compliance*

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time
Emergency Response	80.0	7 minutes
Actual		
Emergency Response	75.5	7 minutes

---

#### 3.9.1 Maintaining Threshold

FIRE/EMS - Emergency Response Times Since 1994		
Years	Call Volume	% of All Call Response w/in 7:00 Minutes
FY 2002-03	8,088	75.5%
FY 2001-02	7,626	69.7%
FY 2000-01	7,128	80.8%
FY 1999-00	6,654	79.7%
CY 1999	6,344	77.2%
CY 1998	4,119	81.9%
CY 1997	6,275	82.4%
CY 1996	6,103	79.4%
CY 1995	5,885	80.0%
CY 1994	5,701	81.7%

**Issue:** Last year the GMOC listed three fundamental issues that in part explained the lower decline in response times from FY 00-01 when the threshold was met, these were:

- (1) the correct fire station configuration given Chula Vista's current and future population and physical layout,
- (2) continued explicit and formal Fire Department input into community design considerations, and



- (3) improved management information systems in regards to monitoring response times .

In addition to the three items listed above, the GMOC is also asking the question of whether changes in state regulations regarding equipment and uniform readiness prior to departure has created longer response times, particular in the turn-out phase.

**Support:**

The GMOC supports the current Fire Department initiative to prepare a Strategic Plan and then an updated Master Plan. Through this effort the Fire Department can reassess how the number and physical location of fire stations, equipment, and staffing, are optimum to meet community needs. The GMOC looks forward to receiving these documents as they are developed.

**Recommendation:**

The GMOC continues to recommend that the Fire Department makes formal and written comments to development review bodies on the impact of community design on response time. The GMOC would appreciate receiving copies of such reviews so we are better acquainted with the relevant issues being discussed.

**Recommendation:**

Last year the GMOC recommended that response time feedback on a daily basis broken out by individual trip and station would offer the Fire Department a tool to better diagnose the situation and perhaps identify procedural/operational changes that could improve response times. The GMOC was pleased to learn that such a program was implemented and was a significant factor in the reduction of turn-out times. This level of review is recommended to be continued.

**Recommendation:**

That the City Council direct the City Manager to assign staff to undertake an assessment on the amount of time added to a response due to changes in legislation, procedural requirements, and equipment-uniform changes that have taken place since 1989. With this information the GMOC can better assess how response times have been impacted by legal, management, and technological changes rather than to growth. At this time the GMOC cannot state with certainty that response time threshold failure is due to growth.

## 3.10 TRAFFIC

### Threshold:

*City-wide:* Maintain Level of Service (LOS) “C” or better as measured by observed average travel speed on all signalized arterial segments, except that during peak hours a LOS “D” can occur for no more than two hours of the day.

*West of I-805:* Those signalized intersections that do not meet the standard above, may continue to operate at their current 1991 LOS, but shall not worsen.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

#### CURRENT

*In Compliance*

#### FUTURE

*Likely Met*

---

### 3.10.1 Traffic Workshop

#### Issue:

During last years GMOC community workshop to present the draft recommendations numerous questions were raised about the nature of the traffic threshold standard and how it is measured. In response to this the GMOC hosted a workshop on November 13, 2003 where the City’s Engineering Department staff provided a presentation and responded to questions. Approximately 50 community members attended.

The questions received were principally on the timing of planned road improvements and transit. The issue of the traffic threshold itself and how it is measured did not become a focus for discussion. The GMOC considers the workshop a success.

### 3.10.2 Traffic Threshold Met

#### Issue:

Many in the community are concerned that the traffic threshold is met when they have experienced a deterioration in travel speed over the years. This is an understandable reaction. We offer two considerations:

- (1) The roads in eastern Chula Vista are undergoing almost continuous construction for either putting in another lane or

adding sewer and water capacity. Roads undergoing such improvements are by definition not functioning at their design capacity and are therefore not subject to monitoring. Therefore, traffic created by road construction is not included when measuring threshold compliance.

(2) Many of the roads were initially “over built”. That is they were designed to provide level of service C to the build out population long before that population moved in. As a result, in the early years roads like Telegraph and East H Street were viewed like Olympic Parkway is today providing a level of service A or B. But now those streets are functioning at their design capacity and this is perceived as traffic levels above what some feel is desirable. But, the current traffic levels are within the threshold limits which is level of service C with no more than 2 hours of D.

### **3.10.3 Timely Construction of SR-125**

**Issue:** The timely construction of SR-125 is critical for the City to maintain the quality of life standards for traffic. Currently, the projected completion of SR-125 is expected by the end of calendar year 2006. A possible early opening of the Birch Road to SR-54 northbound link may come as early as late-summer of 2006.

**Recommendation:** That City Council continues to support the timely construction of SR-125 to avoid a potential traffic threshold failure in eastern Chula Vista.

### **3.10.4 Moderating Growth Due to Traffic Impacts**

**Issue:** Based upon traffic model analysis conducted through the City’s Engineering Department and outside consultants, the City’s road system is expected to function within the growth management quality of life threshold given three factors:

1. Efforts are being undertaken to increase road capacity including:
  - East H Street west-to-north bound I-805 on-ramp improvements to be under construction by summer and completed by end of calendar year 2004 (east bound improvements were completed in March 2003);
  - Telegraph Canyon Road north side widening project to I-805 interchange, construction is underway on the channel and shopping center entrance improvements and the roadway completion date is end of calendar year 2004 (we are not widening the on-ramp);

- Improvement of the Olympic Parkway I-805 interchange construction starts by May 2004 and construction is completed by end of 2005;
  - Promoting Transportation Demand Management Techniques (TDM).
2. The City has implemented a residential building “Permit Monitoring” program that matches future growth in eastern Chula Vista with road capacity till the time SR-125 opens.
  3. In the event of a growth management traffic threshold failure, the provisions in the growth management ordinance will override the “Permit Monitoring” program.

**Recommendation:** That the City Council does not approve additional residential development to receive building permits in eastern Chula Vista prior to the opening of SR-125 above what the current Permit Monitoring Program allows without verified additional traffic capacity that will be in place concurrent with development.

### **3.10.5 Traffic Issues: Highway Congestion and Transit Threshold**

**Issue:** In last years report the GMOC made 2 recommendations for additional research that has been provided. This information related to Chula Vista’s contribution to traffic increases on I-805 and the development of a transit quality of life standard.

#### **3.10.5 A Growth Impact on Highway Traffic**

Not surprisingly, City growth has added to highway congestion. The magnitude of this contribution is what is in question. Overall, traffic counts indicate that Chula Vista’s share of the amount of traffic on I-805 is around 33%. In terms of how much Chula Vista’s growth contributes to the year to year increase in traffic, it was found that from 1997 to 2001 about 30% of the change in the traffic count can be attributed to Chula Vista. This means that non-city influences accounted for about 70% of the traffic increase on the I-805.

The City has limited means to influence highway improvements on I-5 or I-805 through the City’s membership in SANDAG. Given this, it is unlikely that local growth could be regulated based on the finding that city growth has an impact on highway congestion. And, even if the city were to restrict growth the vast majority of the increases in traffic are outside of the City’s jurisdiction so traffic levels would continue to build. Therefore, further action by the GMOC is not contemplated at this time.

The GMOC recognizes that addressing highway traffic congestion requires a regional solution. While the GMOC is not in a position to endorse a specific solution, we are aware of current regional proposals to

deal with traffic being discussed through SANDAG. This is viewed as the correct forum for such matters.

### **3.10.5 B      A Transit Threshold**

A transit level of service threshold was also evaluated. Principally because transit service itself is externally funded and because it is a reoccurring cost with no long term financial commitment, it was not deemed practical to create a threshold related to service. However, physical improvements and site planning that are designed to accommodate transit are within City control and represent a one time capital expense. Such things as bus pull outs, transit medians as on East Palomar Street in Otay Ranch, and pedestrian oriented walkways are examples of possible transit related improvements that can be linked to a threshold. Another alternative is to adopt public policy that such transit related improvements are made a design requirement on designated transit corridors in new planned communities and in redevelopment and intensification projects. The GMOC's initial evaluation is that establishing the appropriate policy structure to require a physical environment that accommodates transit is a more practical approach as opposed to creating a new threshold.

#### **Recommendation:**

That the City Council direct the City Manager to assign the appropriate staff to investigate the practicality, and implement as appropriate, transit design requirements for new planned communities, redevelopment and intensification areas, and report on progress to the GMOC during next years review.

### **3.10.6      Road Classification Error**

#### **Issue:**

In the GMOC report for the 2001 fiscal year review, the City recommended, and the GMOC agreed, that road segments and classifications needed to be updated due to growth and changing situations. It has been reported to the GMOC that two of the road segments were incorrectly identified. Those road segments are:

1. Otay Lakes Rd. (E. H St. – Olympic Parkway): This segment was reclassified as Class I, but should be a Class II.
2. Paseo Ranchero/Heritage Road (Rancho Del Rey Parkway – Olympic Parkway): This segment was added to the Classification Map in 2002 as Class I, but should have been a Class II.

**Recommendation:** The GMOC agrees that road segment classifications needs to be consistent with accepted industry standards, and therefore has no objection and supports the correction.

### **3.10.7 Concurrent Construction and Public Notification**

**Issue:** The City is moving forward with several needed traffic enhancement projects as referenced in item 3.10.2 above. Beginning this summer (2004) there will be simultaneous work on Telegraph Canyon Road, East H Street, and the Olympic Parkway interchange, the 3 major points that residents of eastern Chula Vista access I-805. Much of this activity will continue through the end of the year.

These road improvements are essential and should not be delayed. At the same time there will be increased traffic congestion during construction with little means for avoidance.

**Recommendation:** That the City Council direct the City Manager to assign appropriate staff to investigate the practicality of employing a daily road construction schedule that avoids work in travel lanes during the morning and afternoon peak travel times.

**Recommendation:** That the City Council directs the City Manager to prepare a public awareness campaign regarding the road construction, the need for it, the rationale for the timing, and schedules.

### 3.11 SCHOOLS

**Threshold:**

The City of Chula Vista shall annually provide the two local School Districts with a 12-18 month forecast and request an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth. The Districts' replies should address the following:

1. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
2. Ability to absorb forecasted growth in affected facilities.
3. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
4. Other relevant information the Districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

**THRESHOLD FINDING:**

**CURRENT:** Capacity used now or committed.

**CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT -**  
*Threshold Met*

**SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT -**  
*Threshold Not Met*

**FORECAST:** Ability to accommodate forecasted growth - Funding and site availability for projected new facilities.

**CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT -**  
*Statement of Concern*

**SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT -**  
*Statement of Concern*

---

### 3.11.1

## Threshold Compliance

### Discussion:

The school threshold issue is undoubtedly the most complex topic the GMOC has to consider. Schools are among the most important community resources but since the schools are governed by a political body separate from the City, the GMOC has no direct means to affect change. Moreover, because of Senate Bill 50, which was enacted to obtain support from the Building Industry Association (BIA) for school bond issues, local governments cannot require extra fees or require the establishment of a Mello Roos from new development to finance schools. So, although the City can levy fees for road, sewer, and park improvements, the city cannot do the same for schools. Nor can cities regulate the rate or growth of residential development based on school impacts.

Even though there is little recourse for action, the GMOC believes that it must take a strong position when a school threshold is in question.

In this context the GMOC must make a judgment call on whether the schools are accommodating the existing student population and whether there will be adequate capacity to accommodate future students in the next 5 years. If the GMOC believes that students are not being accommodated now, then the threshold fails. If the GMOC believes that accommodation cannot be made in the future, a "Statement of Concern" is issued.

The definition of the term "accommodate" is key. If accommodate means to physically house students, that each student has a chair, then the threshold, by one means or another, will likely be met. If, however, the term accommodate is used in a broader context that includes more qualitative topics such as adequate non-classroom facilities as restrooms, proper lighting, or technologically equipped, then a threshold failure is possible.

### Statement:

The GMOC defines "accommodate" as referenced in the Schools quality of life threshold language, to mean more than just to house students. In the spirit of creating a quality of life threshold, surely quality of life cannot be left simply to being housed, but must instead be inclusive of those aspects that give it quality. The GMOC will strive to associate quantitative values to define adequate accommodation, recognizing that some aspects may be self-evident.

The GMOC has attempted to obtain relevant information from the SUHSD in regard to facility and campus adequacy. As referenced in the GMOC 2000 Annual Report, the SUHSD was requested to provide information on:

- What constitutes adequate outdoor activity space.



- To identify facility deficiencies that will not be met by the \$187 million bond issue and describe how these deficiencies will be addressed.
- Present current or develop standards of what constitutes adequate non-classroom in-door facilities relative to student population and if these standards are being met.

These requests have not been addressed.

The GMOC is advised that a Facilities Master Plan for the SUHSD is being prepared. This plan should provide a more objective guideline upon which the GMOC can base future assessments.

#### **Finding:**

Until the Facilities Master Plan is completed, the GMOC must conclude that the middle and high schools within the City of Chula Vista are not currently providing consistent and adequate accommodation for students, and therefore the GMOC believes that **the threshold standard has not been met**. Schools and classrooms differ tremendously in attributes among the various schools. While it is not expected that each school and classroom will be equivalent it is expected that a minimum standard will be in place so as to be equitable. Great disparities are self evident in the quality of maintenance, air conditioning, accessibility to technology, erosion of recreational space to relocatable classrooms, ratio of functional restrooms per student, and cafeteria capacity, to name some. In next years review, the GMOC will again request that the SUHSD provide objective physical criteria upon which to evaluate adequate accommodation.

### **3.11.2**

#### **Growth and School Financing**

#### **Issue:**

School financing in new growth areas has been accomplished through the willingness of developers to add Mello Roos fees to their homes. While not required to do so, developers understand that without schools the marketability and therefore value of their homes will suffer. While this is a product of enlightened self-interest, many suburban developers in other areas are still not willing to add these fees to their homes. Chula Vista is fortunate to have the willingness of the developers who are building in our eastern areas. This financing stream is then used to match state funds, and school construction goes foreword.

In urban areas experiencing infill and demographic change financing is not so easy. When a new home is built or added on to, the owner must pay a set per foot fee with the maximum set by the state to offset school impacts. In Chula Vista that per foot fee is about \$3.00 and covers both elementary and secondary schools. According to the school districts this amount is far short of what it takes to reach the match level to attract state funds for new construction. The other way to finance schools is for the impacted area to establish a community finance district (CFD) and

then assess themselves a Mello Roos fee to pay for the school. This requires a 2/3 vote of approval from residents to pass. Most believe that such self-assessment is unlikely to receive the necessary votes, particularly in the lower income parts of the city and where there is a predominance of rental property by non-resident owners.

There are three growth dynamics in play in the City's older urban areas. The first is thus far anecdotal, due to the steadily rising cost of housing it is believed that household sizes are increasing and the occurrence of more than one family per home/apartment is also increasing. Both of these actions produce more children per home/apartment. The second is the recently enacted right to build an accessory unit of 850 square feet on single-family lots. An 850 square foot unit is suitable to support a small 2 bedroom home/apartment. Depending upon the market, this could contribute an additional source of new students. And third, there is the possibility for residential intensification with increased densities across the range from town-home style, to low-mid and high-rise (8 to 14 stories) development.

Judging the acceptability of paying increased fees to pay for schools is speculative. As referenced earlier, areas experiencing demographic change and increased accessory units may not agree to a self-assessment. Residential intensification may be more agreeable to accept the fee but a school impact fee cannot be mandated. If the builder does not see the marketing advantage of having school availability they may not agree.

The school districts and the City are aware of the impending demands that may be made on the areas' established schools. These demands will exceed the school districts' capacity to house the students. The remedy to build additional capacity is hampered due to the lack of local financing. The Chula Vista area cannot be alone in facing this dilemma. Other jurisdictions, as close as San Diego, have faced the problem of financing schools in urban areas and found solutions.

The GMOC believes that finding a solution for financing construction of new school capacity in the City's established neighborhoods is of paramount importance. It is not enough for the school districts to ask the City for assistance, the respective school districts should take the lead role once the broad growth parameters are identified, as they have been. In that regard, by this action the GMOC is issuing a **"Statement of Concern"** to both school districts that operate in Chula Vista to undertake proactive research on identifying financing options that are both feasible and politically acceptable for building schools in Chula Vista's urban areas.

This action by the GMOC of issuing a "Statement of Concern" requires the City Council to consider the adoption of a resolution reflecting that concern during the public hearing on the GMOC's report (aka Joint Workshop), to be directed to the school districts with follow-up to assure appropriate response by that agency.

**Recommendation:** That the City Council agree to issue a resolution to both school district boards reflecting the need to undertake proactive research on identifying financing options that are both feasible and politically acceptable for building schools in Chula Vista's urban areas. A copy of this resolution to be sent to the Schools Ad-Hoc Committee.

**Recommendation:** Although it is the school districts responsibility to take the lead role in identifying financing, this issue will likely require multi-jurisdictional cooperation and contribution. Schools are a key community resource that recognizes no jurisdictional boundary. In that regard, the GMOC recommends that the City Council direct the City Manager to assemble a team of staff from the City, to assist school district staff in a review of financing options that are both feasible and politically acceptable, and report to both the GMOC and the Schools Ad Hoc Committee, on their findings.

### 3.11.3 School Construction

**Discussion:** Both school districts serving Chula Vista, Chula Vista Elementary School District (CVESD) and the Sweetwater Union High School District (SUHSD) have engaged in significant building and expansion programs to match the areas rapid growth. The school district's efforts are commendable. At the same time the pressure to provide more classrooms and more schools to satisfy demand shows no sign of a slowdown. In response to this challenge each district is continuing to expand.

#### 3.11.3 A School Construction – Elementary Schools

**Issue:** In last years GMOC report, it was recognized that the CVESD had maintained a pace of building a new elementary school a year not to mention the addition of relocatable classrooms on existing school sites. As one of last years recommendations the GMOC stated that over the next 2 years that 3 schools be built as compared to the usual 2. It has been reported that over the last year construction of 2 schools has commenced, one located in Rolling Hills Ranch and the other in EastLake. The next school is targeted to be in Otay Ranch Village 6.

**Recommendation:** That the City continues to work with the CVESD in building schools in a timely fashion, with the school in Otay Ranch Village 6 and then Village 11 being on the critical path of development.

### 3.11.3 B School Construction - Middle and High Schools

#### Issue:

The SUHSD has completed the construction of 2 high schools and 1 middle school in the last two years. The only thing more remarkable than this achievement is that this added capacity at the high school level will be consumed in the next 2 years. It was reported last year by the SUHSD that another high school, starting with a 9<sup>th</sup> grade class, is needed for the school year beginning in 2006.

The SUHSD, the City of Chula Vista, and the development community are working in close coordination to meet this timeframe. Currently new high school sites are being evaluated, funding is anticipated to be available, and plans used for the Otay Ranch High School can be reused so as to fast track the approval process. Site selection will be contingent upon receiving the necessary environmental approvals and the ability to provide infrastructure to the location in a timely fashion so that construction can begin on schedule. City assistance has been requested and given to facilitate this effort.

While the GMOC recognizes that focused effort is being undertaken to bring the high school on-line in a timely fashion there is no room for delay in an already compressed development program. Delays, however, are all too common. Given this situation the GMOC would be remiss if it did not recognize this situation and determine that a potentially serious problem exists with respect to school capacity if the construction schedule is not met. This warrants a formal **“Statement of Concern”**.

This “Statement” requires the City Council to consider the adoption of a resolution reflecting that concern during the public hearing on the GMOC’s report (aka Joint Workshop), to be directed to the school districts with follow-up to assure appropriate response by that agency.

#### Recommendation:

That the City Council agree to issue a resolution to the SUHSD Board reflecting the potentially serious situation that will result if a delay in the construction of the next high school occurs. To prepare for this possibility, the resolution will call upon the SUHSD to prepare a “Contingency Plan” for how students will be accommodated in the event of a delay. The Contingency Plan to be ready within 6 months for public discussion. A copy of this resolution to be sent to the Schools Ad Hoc Committee.

### 3.11.4 Joint Use

#### Issue:

Schools belong to the community. Naturally their priority is for education. But schools are also a community resource and should be potentially available for broader usage. In fact this philosophy is in

practice with a joint use library, some joint use recreational resources, and joint use of facilities. The GMOC holds public workshops in school facilities and recognizes this as a form of joint use.

The overall success of joint use activities depends upon the mutual benefit that can be derived between the City and the school districts. While some successes can be pointed to, there are also examples of failure. These failures have been attributed to organizational culture and the individual principal being able to act unilaterally in restricting such activities. Ultimately, the joint use agreement fails when the two parties do not see an overriding benefit.

Workshop Draft



